

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamanaka. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest), among other things, the wall part bent from the side walls of lower and upper covers, as described in claim 1. A flexible cable is held between these wall parts. In this manner, the present invention prevents the flexible cable from being peeled off at the portion connected to the liquid crystal substrate.

In contrast, the object of Yamanaka is to improve heat radiation characteristics, and prevent deterioration of image quality due to changes in the cell gap of the liquid crystal display device. The liquid crystal display of Yamanaka includes a flexible wiring F mounted on the TFT substrate 2 and sandwiched between a metal frame M1 and frame M2. The lower frame M2 includes a horizontal lower wall and a vertical side wall extending upwardly from the lower wall. Similarly, the upper frame M1 includes a horizontal upper wall and a vertical side wall extending downwardly from the upper wall. The flexible wiring F is held between the thickness of the opposing vertical side walls.

In the present invention, the lower and upper covers include the lower and upper walls (shown in horizontal orientation in the figures), and the side walls which extend substantially perpendicularly from the lower and upper walls. A wall part is bent from the side walls, and a flexible cable (flexible wiring) is held by these opposing wall parts. The vertical side walls of Yamanaka does not have a wall part, which bends from the side walls,

as in the present invention, and accordingly, does not disclose (or suggest) that a flexible cable extends between these opposing wall parts.

The Office Action states that the claimed wall part is disclosed by the “bottom portion” of the vertical side walls of the upper frame M1 and the lower frame M2. Applicant respectfully submits that this is an improper interpretation of the Yamanaka reference. Fig. 4 of Yamanaka merely shows that the flexible wire F is sandwiched between the metal frame M1 and the metal frame M2” (col. 6, lines 54-56). In other words, the flexible wire F is held between the thickness of the vertical side walls of metal frames M1 and M2, and not by the parts that are bent from the side walls. To interpret the thickness of the side wall of Yamanaka as disclosing the claimed wall part, which is bent from the side wall, is overly broad as to be improper. For at least this reason, claims 1-4 are allowable over Yamanaka.

Claim 2 is further traversed because the cited reference does not disclose that the flexible cable is bonded to the wall part of the lower cover. As described above, the Yamanaka reference merely teaches that the flexible wiring F is sandwiched between the middle frames M1 and M2. This does not disclose or suggest flexible cable which is bonded to the wall part of the lower cover. For this reason also, claim 2 is allowable over Yamanaka.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamanaka in view of Lee et al. Applicant traverses this rejection for the reasons given with respect to claim 1, from which claim 3 depends.

Moreover, claim 3 of the present invention recites “said one of the substrates comes into contact with said wall part of the lower cover.” Examiner contends that this

feature is taught by Fig. 20 of Lee, by making reference to the wall part of the substrate 214 (one of the substrates) being in contact with the lower cover 300.

The member denoted by reference numeral 300 in Fig. 20 of Lee is "upper mold frame 300," as described in column 13, line 28 of the reference, for example. This is not the lower cover as recited in claim 3 of the present invention. Therefore, even if combined, the cited references still would not disclose or suggest that one of the substrates comes into contact with the wall part of the lower cover.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

December 12, 2005

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978